



DELAINE EASTIN
State Superintendent of Public Instruction

CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT
OF
EDUCATION

721 Capitol Mall

P.O. Box 944272

Sacramento, CA

94244-2720

April 18, 2001

Ruth Ryder, Director
U.S. Department of Education
Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
Division of Monitoring and State Improvement Planning
330 C Street, S.W.
Switzer Bldg. Room 3609
Washington, D.C. 20202-2500

Dear Ms. Ryder,

Pursuant to the OSEP letter to CDE on December 4, 2000, "Special Conditions for FFY 2000-2001, Part B of IDEA, the California Department of Education (CDE) must provide OSEP specific information through report submission due to OSEP on April 18, 2001. CDE submits the April 18, 2001 required information. This is CDE's second report submission to OSEP and provides information as required.

For this April 18, 2001 report, CDE segments the report into three parts. Based upon available data, individual attachments are provided regarding selected districts as well as narrative information in this report.

➤ **PART I Compliance Information on Selected Districts**

For this April 18, 2001 report, CDE provides summary narrative follow-up data (described in I.A.2.1I) and the State's determination regarding the extent of the district's compliance with the requirements in addition to specific district data provided (See attachments).

For this April 18, 2001 report, CDE provides updated compliance information for the 22 districts **pursuant to special condition I.A.4. d. i through v.** All data cannot be provided as several districts are in process of a verification review, scheduled for a verification review or in process of follow up to the verification review of 1999-2000. As compliance data becomes available, CDE will provide this data in a future CDE submission to OSEP on June 8, 2001.

➤ **PART II CASEMIS Data on Selected Districts**

For this April 18, 2001 report, CDE provides CASEMIS data **pursuant to special condition I. A. 5.** on all 22 districts.

➤ **PART III CDE Enforcement Actions**

For this April 18, 2001 report, CDE provides a description of each enforcement action (including any of the sanction options listed on page 52 of CDE's December 21, 1999 submission to OSERS) that CDE has taken between November 30, 2000 and March 15, 2001, with any public agency in the state **pursuant to special condition I. A. 5.**

From the data provided, I believe OSEP can see the effectiveness of CDE's monitoring and supervisory approaches. The results clearly demonstrate CDE's diligence and effectiveness in conducting its supervisory authority regarding IDEA.

Should any questions arise regarding this report submission, please call me anytime.

Sincerely,

Alice D. Parker, Ed.D.
Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction
Director, Special Education Division

Enclosures
ADP: GK:gk
cc: Delaine Eastin, State Superintendent of Public Instruction
Scott Hill
Leslie Fausset
Henry Der
Linda Cabatic (Michael Hersher)

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

SPECIAL EDUCATION DIVISION

Special Conditions for FFY 2000-2001
IDEA Part B Grant Award

REPORT #2

TO THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

on

APRIL 18, 2001

PART I Compliance Information on Selected Districts Special Condition Requirement I.A.4. d. i through v.

For this April 18, 2001 report, CDE provides updated compliance information for the 22 districts pursuant to special condition I. A. 5.

April 18, 2001 Districts for Reporting to OSEP (Follow up monitoring and/or verification review results)

DISTRICT

1. Antelope Valley Union High School District
2. Cajon Valley Union Elementary
3. Compton Unified School District
4. Fairfield Suisun Unified School District
5. Holtville Unified School District
6. Los Angeles Unified School District (D)
7. Lynwood Unified School District
8. Norwalk LaMirada Unified School District
9. Mt. Diablo Unified School District
10. Oakland Unified School District
11. Sacramento City Unified School District
12. Santa Barbara Elementary School District
13. San Pasqual Unified School District
14. W. Contra Costa Unified School District

STATUS AS OF 4/18/01

CDE follow up monitoring
Compliance Report provided
CDE follow up monitoring
Partial follow up completed
Follow Up Report provided
Follow Up status provided
CDE follow up monitoring
CDE follow up monitoring
Partial follow up completed
Partial follow up completed
Follow Up status provided
Follow Up Report provided
Follow Up Report provided
Follow Up Report provided

June 8, 2001 Districts for Reporting to OSEP (Follow up monitoring and/or verification review results)

1. Conejo Valley Unified
2. Los Angeles Unified School Districts
3. Ravenswood City Elementary
4. San Diego City Unified School District
5. San Francisco Unified School District
6. Del Norte County Unified
7. Pomona Unified
8. Fresno Unified

(Verification Review 4/4-6, 9-11/01)
(Follow up March 19, 2001, two verification reviews to be conducted the weeks of 4/16 and 4/23)
(Verification Review scheduled 5/8-11/01)
(Follow up continuing through March/April)
(Follow up continuing through March/April)
(Verification Review 5/21-25/01)
(Verification Review 2/5-9/01-results in analysis)
(Verification Review 3/13-16/01-results in analysis)

PART II CASEMIS Data on Selected Districts Special Condition Requirement I. A. e.

I. A. e. As separate reports, For each of the 22 districts, CDE will provide OSEP information on or before January 12, 2001 and not later than August 10, 2001, CASEMIS data submitted to CDE by districts (December 1, 2000 and June 30, 2001) data regarding:

- The number of students with disabilities who do not have a current IEP (i.e., an IEP that has been developed or reviewed, and if appropriate revised, within the last 12 months);
- The number of students with disabilities who do not have a current evaluation or reevaluation (i.e., an initial evaluation or reevaluation that was conducted within the past 36 months);

For this April 18, 2001 report, CDE provides CASEMIS data for all 22 districts pursuant to special condition I. A. e.

June 2000	Students receiving special education services	Overdue IEP, 3-Year Reevaluation or both		Overdue 3-Year Reevaluation	Overdue IEP	Overdue both
District	Number	Number	Percent	Number	Number	Number
Antelope Valley Union High	2,504	172	6.9%	28	118	26
Cajon Valley Union Elementary	2,904	187	6.4%	24	140	23
Compton Unified	3,214	178	5.5%	82	87	9
Conejo Valley Unified	1,822	78	4.3%	1	76	1
Del Norte County Unified	739	64	8.7%	14	38	12
Etiwanda Elementary	906	69	7.6%	13	50	6
Fairfield-Suisun Unified	3,240	129	4.0%	18	103	8
Fresno Unified	10,127	1,495	14.8%	297	901	297
Holtville Unified	256	0	0.0%	0	0	0
Los Angeles Unified	101,799	3,313	3.3%	26	3,235	52
Lynwood Unified	1,461	369	25.3%	47	173	149
Mt. Diablo Unified	5,956	232	3.9%	51	141	40
Norwalk-La Mirada Unified	2,627	669	25.5%	152	410	107
Oakland Unified	7,147	510	7.1%	41	354	115
Pomona Unified	3,727	375	10.1%	154	137	84
Ravenswood City Elementary	503	71	14.1%	58	8	5
Sacramento City Unified	7,889	329	4.2%	63	191	75
San Diego City Unified	17,480	1,264	7.2%	241	703	320
San Francisco Unified	7,740	1,402	18.1%	0	1,320	82
San Pasqual Valley Unified	149	5	3.4%	1	2	2
Santa Barbara Elementary	999	4	0.4%	2	2	0
West Contra Costa Unified	5,445	2,050	37.6%	516	1,019	515
Total 22 Districts	188,634	12,965	6.9%	1,829	9,208	1,928
December 2000	Students receiving special education services	Overdue IEP, 3-Year Reevaluation or both		Overdue 3-Year Reevaluation	Overdue IEP	Overdue both
District	Number	Number	Percent	Number	Number	Number
Antelope Valley Union High	2418	225	9.3%	65	116	44
Cajon Valley Union Elementary	2201	141	6.4%	26	100	15
Compton Unified	2171	215	9.9%	60	130	25
Conejo Valley Unified	1765	65	3.7%	49	16	0
Del Norte County Unified	518	33	6.4%	7	23	3
Etiwanda Elementary	783	52	6.6%	13	31	8
Fairfield-Suisun Unified	2524	64	2.5%	9	51	4
Fresno Unified	8691	877	10.1%	216	536	125
Holtville Unified	213	4	1.9%	0	4	0
Los Angeles Unified	77850	2355	3.0%	19	2295	41
Lynwood Unified	1093	336	30.7%	39	169	128
Mt. Diablo Unified	4890	198	4.0%	61	117	20
Norwalk-La Mirada Unified	2182	442	20.3%	149	223	70
Oakland Unified	5458	184	3.4%	20	115	49
Pomona Unified	3557	502	14.1%	241	174	87
Ravenswood City Elementary	437	40	9.2%	13	23	4
Sacramento City Unified	5986	121	2.0%	31	66	24
San Diego City Unified	14780	746	5.0%	232	361	153
San Francisco Unified	6309	1093	17.3%	0	1041	52
San Pasqual Valley Unified	124	9	7.3%	0	8	1
Santa Barbara Elementary	763	0	0.0%	0	0	0
West Contra Costa Unified	4189	1138	27.2%	659	328	151
Total 22 Districts	148,902	8,840	5.9%	1,909	5,927	1,004

PART III CDE Enforcement Actions
Special Condition Requirement I. A. 5.

A. 5 In order to demonstrate that it takes effective enforcement actions to ensure compliance where previous corrective measures have not ensured compliance, CDE must ensure that OSEP receive from the State, on or before January 10, 2001 a report, as current through November 30, 2000, and that OSEP receive from the State, on or before April 18, 2001, a report, as current through March 15, 2001, each of which includes a description of each enforcement action (including any of the sanction options listed on page 52 of CDE's December 21, 1999 submission to OSERS) that CDE has taken, since June 15, 2000, with any public agency in the state, including:

- a. A specific description of the action taken;
- b. The date of the action; and
- c. The impact of the action on compliance and the provision of services to children with disabilities.

For this April 18, 2001 report, CDE provides information to OSEP regarding enforcement/sanction actions taken by CDE for various LEAs from November 30, 2000 to March 15, 2001. The data provided includes: date of final report sent to the LEA, LEA name, compliance complaint #, and the required enforcement/sanction (compensatory education, reimbursement, local school board hearings, civil action, fiscal withholding, offer of technical assistance, and outcome of CDE effectiveness (e.g. closed (resolved) with all corrective actions met and/or "open" with CDE awaiting corrective actions not yet received or approved by CDE).

**CDE Enforcement/Sanction Actions Update
November 30, 2000 to March 15, 2001**

For this April 18, 2001 report, and as of March 15, 2001, none of the following compliance complaints has required CDE enforcement activities of civil action or fiscal withholding. Technical assistance is offered for any compliance complaint.

Date CDE Final Report	District	Compliance Complaint Number	Local Board Hearing	Compensatory Education Ed.	Reimb.	Outcome
12-1-00	LONG BEACH UNIFIED	S-0475-00/01	X			Open-awaiting evidence
12-1-00	LONG BEACH UNIFIED	S-0477-00/01	X	X		Closed- Case withdrawn
12-1-00	WEST CONTRA COSTA UNIFIED	S-0490-00/01	X			Open- Due 10/1/01
12-5-00	TORRANCE UNIFIED	S-0491-00/01	X			Open-awaiting evidence
12-5-00	PLUMAS COUNTY SCHOOLS	S-0501-00/01	X			Open-evidence in CDE review
12-5-00	LONG BEACH UNIFIED	S-0495-00/01	X	X		Open- Due 5/2/01
12-6-00	PLUMAS UNIFIED	S-0496-00/01	X			Open-evidence in CDE review
12-6-00	SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED	S-0498-00/01	X			Open-evidence in CDE review
12-6-00	GILROY UNIFIED	S-0508-00/01	X			Open-evidence in CDE review
12-7-00	SAN JOSE UNIFIED	S-0500-00/01	X			Open-evidence in CDE review
12-7-00	LOS ANGELES UNIFIED	S-0502-00/01	X			Open- Corrective Actions due 3/28/01
12-7-00	FRESNO UNIFIED	S-0507-00/01	X			Open-evidence not yet due
12-7-00	SAN DIEGO CITY UNIFIED	S-0512-00/01	X			Open-due 5/7/01
12-7-00	LOS ANGELES UNIFIED	S-0513-00/01	X			Open-Corrective Actions due 3/26/01
12-7-00	ELK GROVE UNIFIED	S-0591-00/01	X			Closed-in due process
12-8-00	SAN JOSE UNIFIED	S-0524-00/01	X			Open- No evidence received
12-11-00	RIALTO UNIFIED	S-0515-00/01	X			Open-evidence not yet due
12-11-00	MONROVIA UNIFIED	S-0504-00/01	X			Open-evidence not yet due
12-12-00	PASADENA UNIFIED	S-0509-00/01	X			Closed
12-12-00	LOS ANGELES UNIFIED	S-0510-00/01		X		Open-Corrective Actions due 3/21/01
12-12-00	SAN JOSE UNIFIED	S-0525-00/01	X			Open-evidence due 4/14/01
12-13-00	SUNNYVALE ELEMENTARY	S-0519-00/01	X			Open-evidence not yet due
12-13-00	MONTGOMERY ELEMENTARY	S-0520-00/01	X			Open-evidence not yet due
12-13-00	PORTERVILLE UNIFIED	S-0523-00/01	X			Closed
12-13-00	TUSTIN UNIFIED	S-0530-00/01	X			Open-evidence not yet due
12-13-00	TAMALPAIS UNION HIGH	S-0549-00/01	X			Closed-In due process
12-14-00	SAN DIEGO CITY UNIFIED	S-0499-00/01	X			Open- due 5/11/01
12-15-00	CASTRO VALLEY UNIFIED	S-0541-00/01	X			Closed-Case withdrawn
12-18-00	BAKERSFIELD CITY ELEMENTARY	S-0532-00/01	X			Open-evidence not yet due
12-18-00	SAN LORENZO VALLEY UNIFIED	S-0533-00/01	X			Open-evidence in CDE review
12-18-00	CALAVERAS UNIFIED	S-0535-00/01		X		Closed-4/3/01

Date CDE Final Report	District	Compliance Complaint Number	Local Board Hearing	Compensatory Education Ed.	Reimb.	Outcome
12-18-00	ELK GROVE UNIFIED	S-0551-00/01	X			Open-evidence in CDE review
12-19-00	LOS ANGELES UNIFIED	S-0537-00/01	X			Open-evidence not yet due
12-19-00	LOS ANGELES UNIFIED	S-0538-00/01	X			Open-evidence not yet due
12-20-00	SAN MATEO UNION HIGH	S-0540-00/01	X	X		Open- Evidence due 4/11/01
12-20-00	LONG BEACH UNIFIED	S-0542-00/01	X			Open-evidence not yet due
12-20-00	LOS ANGELES UNIFIED	S-0548-00/01	X			Open-evidence not yet due
12-22-00	IRVINE UNIFIED	S-0550-00/01	X			Open-evidence not yet due
12-20-00	DUBLIN UNIFIED	S-0552-00/01	X			Closed- Case withdrawn
12-26-00	PLUMAS UNIFIED	S-0553-00/01	X	X		Open-evidence in CDE review
12-26-00	LOS ANGELES UNIFIED	S-0554-00/01	X			Open-evidence not yet due
12-26-00	SCOTTS VALLEY UNIFIED	S-0555-00/01	X	X		Open-evidence not yet due
12-26-00	COMPTON UNIFIED	S-0580-00/01		X		Open-evidence not yet due
12-27-00	SAN DIEGO CITY UNIFIED	S-0556-00/01	X	X		Open-due 4/9/01
12-27-00	POWAY UNIFIED	S-0558-00/01	X			Closed-withdrawn
12-27-00	MANHATTAN BEACH UNIFIED	S-0561-00/01	X	X	X	Open-all evidence not yet due
12-27-00	MORENO VALLEY UNIFIED	S-0562-00/01	X			Open-evidence not yet due
12-28-00	JURUPA UNIFIED	S-0564-00/01	X		X	Open-evidence not yet due
1-2-01	TUOLUMNE COUNTY SCHOOLS	S-0581-00/01	X			Open – evidence due 4/9/01
1-3-01	SAN DIEGO CITY UNIFIED	S-0568-00/01	X			Open-due 6/7/01
1-3-01	APPLE VALLEY UNIFIED	S-0569-00/01	X	X		Open-evidence not yet due
1-3-01	LOS ANGELES UNIFIED	S-0574-00/01	X			Open-due 6/5/01
1-3-01	SAN CARLOS ELEMENTARY	S-0575-00/01	X			Open-evidence not yet due
1-3-01	PALMDALE ELEMENTARY	S-0577-00/01	X			Open-evidence not yet due
1-3-01	CONEJO VALLEY UNIFIED	S-0585-00/01	X			Open-evidence not yet due
1-3-01	PANAMA-BUENA VISTA UNION ELEMENTARY	S-0579-00/01	X			Due 4/10/01
1-4-01	HORIZONS INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICE	S-0584-00/01	X			Open-evidence in CDE review
1-5-01	LOS ANGELES UNIFIED	S-0587-00/01	X			Open-evidence not yet due
1-8-01	BUENA PARK ELEMENTARY	S-0589-00/01	X			Open-evidence not yet due
1-8-01	BAKERSFIELD CITY ELEMENTARY	S-0595-00/01	X			Open-evidence not yet due
1-8-01	LOS ANGELES UNIFIED	S-0598-00/01	X			Open-due 6/10/01
1-9-01	IRVINE UNIFIED	S-0592-00/01	X			Open-evidence not yet due
1-10-01	ORANGE UNIFIED	I-0593-00/01		X		Open-due 4/16/01
1-10-01	SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED	S-0596-00/01	X			Open-evidence not yet due
1-11-01	LOS ANGELES UNIFIED	S-0599-00/01	X			Open-due 4/23/01
1-11-01	ORANGE UNIFIED	S-0601-00/01		X		Open-due 4/30/01
1-12-01	CYPRESS ELEMENTARY	S-0600-00/01		X		Open-evidence not yet due
1-12-01	SALIDA UNION HSD	S-0603-00/01	X			Due 6/18/01

Date CDE Final Report	District	Compliance Complaint Number	Local Board Hearing	Compensatory Education Ed.	Reimb.	Outcome
1-12-01	SAN DIEGO CITY UNIFIED	S-0607-00/01	X			Open-evidence not yet due
1-12-01	ABC UNIFIED	S-0609-00/01	X			Open-evidence not yet due
1-16-01	LOS ANGELES UNIFIED	I-0606-00/01	X			Open-evidence not yet due
1-16-01	PALOS VERDES PENINSULA UNIFIED	S-0611-00/01	X			Open-evidence not yet due
1-16-01	LOS ANGELES UNIFIED	S-0612-00/01	X			Open-evidence not yet due
1-17-01	LOS ANGELES UNIFIED	S-0613-00/01	X			Open-due 6/11/01
1-17-01	LOS ANGELES UNIFIED	S-0616-00/01	X			Open-evidence not yet due
1-16-01	WESTERN PLACER USD	S-0617-00/01	X			Open-evidence not yet due
1-19-01	SAN DIEGUITO UNION HIGH	S-0618-00/01	X			Open-due 6/23/01
1-19-01	LOS ANGELES UNIFIED	S-0620-00/01	X			Open-evidence not yet due
1-19-01	DUBLIN UNIFIED	S-0622-00/01	X			Open-evidence in CDE review
1-19-01	OCEANSIDE CITY UNIFIED	S-0623-00/01	X			Open-due 6/23/01
1-23-01	HACIENDA LA PUENTE UNIFIED	S-0628-00/01	X			Open-evidence not yet due
1-23-01	MOORPARK UNIFIED	S-0645-00/01	X			Open-evidence not yet due
1-24-01	LOS ANGELES UNIFIED	S-0630-00/01	X			Open-evidence not yet due
1-25-01	LONG BEACH UNIFIED	S-0634-00/01	X			Open-due 4/16, 5/1, 6/10/01
1-26-01	LONG BEACH UNIFIED	S-0635-00/01	X			Open-evidence not yet due
1-25-01	SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED	S-0636-00/01	X			Open-evidence due 4/28/01
1-26-01	OAKLAND UNIFIED	S-0640-00/01		X		Open-evidence due 4/10/01
1-26-01	LOS ANGELES UNIFIED	S-0644-00/01	X			Open-due 4/10/01
1-26-01	LODI UNIFIED	S-0649-00/01	X			Open-evidence due 5/25/01
1-29-01	LONG BEACH UNIFIED	S-0646-00/01	X			Open-evidence not yet due
1-31-01	BAKERSFIELD CITY ELEMENTARY	S-0651-00/01	X			Open-evidence not yet due
1-31-01	CAPISTRANO UNIFIED	S-0668-00/01	X			Open-evidence not yet due
1-31-01	SANTA ANA UNIFIED	S-0659-00/01	X			Open-evidence not yet due
2-2-01	HUNTINGTON BEACH UNION HIGH	S-0671-00/01	X			Open-evidence not yet due
2-5-01	SAN DIEGO CITY UNIFIED	S-0662-00/01	X			Open-evidence not yet due
2-5-01	LONG BEACH UNIFIED	S-0663-00/01	X			Open-evidence not yet due
2-6-01	ALHAMBRA CITY ELEMENTARY	S-0664-00/01	X			Open-evidence not yet due
2-7-01	CYPRESS ELEMENTARY	S-0670-00/01	X			Open-evidence not yet due
3-13-01	BERKELEY UNIFIED	S-0732-00/01	X			Closed- Case withdrawn
3-14-01	SEQUOIA UNION HIGH	S-0755-00/01	X			Closed- in due process
3/7/01	NAPA VALLEY UNIFIED	I-0760-00/01	X			Closed-case withdrawn
3-16-01	OAK GROVE ELEMENTARY	S-0815-00/01	X			Closed-in due process

Summary of Findings: CDE Data Collection-Special Conditions

- ii. To the extent not already included in I.A.4.d.i. through iv, specific district data, including follow-up data (described in I.A.2.1I) and the State's determination regarding the extent of the district's compliance with the requirements that:
 1. students with disabilities receive all of the related services set forth in their most recent IEP;
 2. IEP teams ensure that students who need psychological counseling as part of FAPE receive it and that: (a) district do not have a practice of not listing these services on IEPs, or b) of advising parents that they can only seek these services through Community Mental Health Services;
 3. Eligible students IEP's include statements of needed transition services;
 4. Parents receive required transition related information before attending IEP meetings; and
 5. Children with disabilities are placed in the least restrictive environment and not in more restrictive environments because IEP teams do not consider supplementary aids and services.

For this April 18, 2001 report, CDE provides updated information to OSEP on the follow up activities conducted by CDE for 22 OSEP selected districts. As part of CDE's monitoring procedures, all 54 districts that received a verification review in 1999-2000 receive an onsite follow up monitoring visit from CDE to ensure compliance has occurred.

CDE conducted intensive probe interviews with parents, staff and administrators, student record reviews, and follow up data collection regarding implementation of IEPs in addition to review of all corrective actions requiring submission of policies and procedures and notification and training of staff regarding these policies and procedures to ensure compliance.

The following narrative information addresses the above 5 areas as required in special conditions I.A.4.d.i. through iv, specific district data, including follow-up data (described in .A.2.1I), to the degree data is available.

➤ *Antelope Valley Union High School District*

CDE will conduct an onsite follow up visit in Antelope Valley Unified School District in April 2001. New student records will be reviewed for all areas determined noncompliant during the 1999-2000 verification review. CDE will conduct interviews with parents, staff and administrators to determine: (1) are students receiving special education and services as stated on the IEP; and (2) district practices in determining and providing related services, transition notice to parents and transition services; and the use of supplementary aids and services as part of LRE requirements.

CDE Findings: As of this April 18, 2001 report, CDE provides other data from CDE's Quality Assurance Process in addition to special conditions data requested by OSEP.

Local Plan: No changes since 1-10-01 OSEP report.

Compliance Complaints: Zero (-0-) compliance complaints filed from November 30, 2000 through March 15, 2001.

Reevaluations: CASEMIS data of December 1, 2000 indicates 65 students overdue for reevaluations

Annual IEPs: CASEMIS data of December 1, 2000 indicates 116 students overdue for annual IEP reviews.

1999-2001 CDE Follow up-Verification Review: Data not yet available

Due Process: Six (6) filings for due process from November 30, 2000 through March 15, 2001

Special Conditions Data Collection: Data not yet available

➤ *Cajon Valley Union Elementary School District*

CDE conducted an onsite Verification Review in Cajon Valley Union Elementary School District during January, 2001.

Prior to onsite verification review, CDE reviewed CASEMIS data and other data about the district. During the verification review, CDE reviewed CASEMIS data with district administration; conducted an evening Parent/Guardian Input Meeting; 50 student records were reviewed for accuracy of data reported by the district to the state and 96 student records for compliance with IDEA. CDE visited classrooms and conducted interviews with parents, staff and administrators to determine: (1) are students receiving special education and services as stated on the IEP; and (2) district practices in determining and providing related services, transition notice to parents and transition services; and the use of supplementary aids and services as part of LRE requirements. (Links to district's status report in Microsoft Excel 5.0/95 Workbook format at end of report)

CDE Findings: As of this April 18, 2001 report, CDE provides other data from CDE's Quality Assurance Process in addition to special conditions data requested by OSEP.

Local Plan: CDE is in receipt and review of the SELPAs (East County SELPA, San Diego) local plan. The SELPA local plan was received by CDE on 2/26/01. CDE first read has been conducted. A second read is in process. All items were submitted as required. Data is not yet available for this report.

Compliance Complaints: Zero (-0-) compliance complaints filed from November 30, 2000 through March 15, 2001.

Reevaluations: CASEMIS data of December 1, 2000 indicates 26 students overdue for reevaluations

Annual IEPs: CASEMIS data of December 1, 2000 indicates 116 students overdue for annual IEP reviews.

1999-2001 CDE Verification Review was completed January 25, 2001 demonstrated eight (8) areas of systemic noncompliance. (Links to district's status report in Microsoft Excel 5.0/95 Workbook format at end of report)

Due Process: Two (2) filings for due process from November 30, 2000 through March 15, 2001

CDE Findings: As of this April 18, 2001 report, Cajon Valley Union Elementary School District has eleven (11) systemic noncompliant findings (possible 800+). These eight findings are:

1. CASEMIS data and student record reviews substantiate that IEPs are not completed within the 50 day timeline
2. Review of student records and staff interviews substantiate that supplementary aids and services and program modifications and support for school personnel are not addressed in IEPs.
3. Record reviews and staff interviews substantiate that district staff are not including an explanation in the IEP of why students with disabilities will not participate with non-disabled peers.
4. Record reviews and staff interviews substantiate that district staff are not including an explanation of how and when parents will be regularly informed of progress toward IEP goals stated in the IEP.
5. Record reviews and staff interviews substantiate that frequency, intensity, duration and location, especially for students receiving Resource Specialist services, are not included in the IEP.
6. Record reviews and staff interviews substantiate that general education teachers do not consistently participate in IEP meetings.
7. Record reviews and staff interviews substantiate that transition services language is not being included in IEPs, particularly in IEPs of children who are 14 years of age.
8. Parent interviews and parent input meeting results substantiate that parent(s) are not aware of the transition process and legal requirements transition services language, especially beginning at age 14.
9. Review of policies and procedures substantiates that Child Find does not include "homeless" and "migrant" students.
10. Review of policies and procedures substantiates that Functional Analysis Evaluation is not addressed in the Procedural Handbook.
11. Review of Policies and Procedures substantiates that there is no policy in the Procedural Handbook indicating parents may request a Functional Analysis Evaluation.

Special Conditions Data Collection:

1. **Students with disabilities receive all of the related services set forth in their most recent IEP;**

CDE Findings: Service providers were questioned as to how they establish level of service(s) and if students receive services as stated on their IEPs. (LSH, County of Mental Health and New Alternatives, a community based Agency counseling.) Interviews demonstrated that students receive the related services stated in their recent IEP. **Compliant 1-25-01**

2. **IEP teams ensure that students who need psychological counseling as part of FAPE receive it and that: (a) district do not have a practice of not listing these services on IEPs, or b) of advising parents that they can only seek these services through Community Mental Health Services;**

CDE Findings: Same as above finding. **Compliant 1-25-01**

3. **Eligible students IEP's include statements of needed transition services;**

CDE Findings: Record reviews and staff interviews substantiate that transition services language is not being included in IEPs, particularly in IEPs of children who are 14 years of age. **Noncompliant 1-25-01**

4. **Parents receive required transition related information before attending IEP meetings;**

CDE Findings: Parent interviews and parent input meeting results substantiate that parent(s) are not aware of the transition process and legal requirements transition services language, especially beginning at age 14. **Noncompliant 1-25-01**

5. **Children with disabilities are placed in the least restrictive environment and not in more restrictive environments because IEP teams do not consider supplementary aids and services.**

CDE Findings: Review of student records and staff interviews substantiate that supplementary aids and services and program modifications and support for school personnel are not addressed in IEPs. **Noncompliant 1-25-01**

➤ ***Compton Unified School District***

CDE will be conducting an onsite follow up review in Compton Unified School District in April 2001. New student records will be pulled and reviewed for all areas determined noncompliant during the 1999-2000 verification review. CDE will conduct interviews with parents, staff and administrators to determine: (1) are students receiving special education and services as stated on the IEP; and (2) district practices in determining and providing related services, transition notice to parents and transition services; and the use of supplementary aids and services as part of LRE requirements.

CDE Findings: As of this April 18, 2001 report, CDE provides other data from CDE's Quality Assurance Process.

Local Plan: CDE is in receipt and review of the SELPAs (Mid-Cities SELPA, San Diego) local plan. The SELPA local plan was received by CDE on 3/21/01. CDE has conducted a first read and will conduct a second read. Data is not yet available for this report.

Compliance Complaints: Three (3) compliance complaints were filed from November 30, 2000 through March 15, 2001.

(S-0580-00/01 indicates noncompliance in not implementing the IEP (RSP) and failure to adhere to a 30 day timeline request for an IEP; S-0808-00/01 in withdrawn; S-0809-00/01 is pending CDE report upon conclusion of investigation.

Reevaluations: CASEMIS data of December 1, 2000 indicates 60 students overdue for reevaluations

Annual IEPs: CASEMIS data of December 1, 2000 indicates 130 students overdue for annual IEP reviews.

1999-2001 CDE Follow up-Verification Review: Data not yet available

Due Process: Two (2) filings for due process from November 30, 2000 through March 15, 2001.

Special Conditions Data Collection: Data not yet available

➤ ***Conejo Valley Unified School District***

CDE is conducting an onsite follow Verification Review in Conejo Valley Unified School District April 4,5,6,9,10,11/01. Data is not yet available.

Local Plan: Data is not provided for this report.

Compliance Complaints: Two (2) compliance complaints were filed from November 30, 2000 through March 15, 2001.

One case was withdrawn. The second case had noncompliances in procedural areas (timelines, IEP members, IEP content, pupil records). **Reevaluations:** CASEMIS data of December 1, 2000 indicates 49 students overdue for reevaluations

Annual IEPs: CASEMIS data of December 1, 2000 indicates 16 students overdue for annual IEP reviews.

1999-2001 CDE Follow up-Verification Review: Data not yet available

Due Process: Three (3) filings for due process from November 30, 2000 through March 15, 2001.

Special Conditions Data Collection: Data not yet available

➤ ***Del Norte County Unified School District***

CDE is conducting an onsite follow Verification Review in Del Norte County Unified School District May 21-25, 2001. Data is not yet available.

Local Plan: Data is not provided for this report..

Compliance Complaints: Zero (-0-) compliance complaints were filed from November 30, 2000 through March 15, 2001.

Reevaluations: CASEMIS data of December 1, 2000 indicates 7 students overdue for reevaluations

Annual IEPs: CASEMIS data of December 1, 2000 indicates 23 students overdue for annual IEP reviews.

1999-2001 CDE Follow up-Verification Review: Data not yet available

Due Process: Two (2) filings for due process from November 30, 2000 through March 15, 2001.

Special Conditions Data Collection: Data not yet available

➤ ***Fairfield Suisun Unified School District***

CDE is conducting an onsite follow up visit in Fairfield Suisun Unified School District in April 2001. New student records were reviewed for all areas determined noncompliant during the 1999-2000 verification review. CDE conducted interviews with parents, staff and administrators to determine: (1) are students receiving special education and services as stated on the IEP; and (2) district practices in determining and providing related services, transition notice to parents and transition services; and the use of supplementary aids and services as part of LRE requirements.

CDE Findings: As of this April 18, 2001 report, CDE provides other data from CDE's Quality Assurance Process.

Local Plan: See 1-10-01 OSEP report.

Compliance Complaints: Zero (-0-) compliance complaints filed from November 30, 2000 through March 15, 2001.

Reevaluations: CASEMIS data of December 1, 2000 indicates 9 students overdue for reevaluations

Annual IEPs: CASEMIS data of December 1, 2000 indicates 51 students overdue for annual IEP reviews.

1999-2001 CDE Follow up-Verification Review: The district has provided CDE with all required Corrective Actions including evidence of forms, policies, procedures and training activities. The district provided training notices, agendas, and sign in sheets. CDE reviewed all data for items found noncompliant in 1999-2000. All submitted evidence is compliant. The district has been instructed by CDE as of 3/22/01 to revise a student list to ensure that CDE's onsite review would address noncompliant areas. Data not yet available on compliance correction for all items found noncompliant.

Due Process: One (1) filing for due process from November 30, 2000 through March 15, 2001.

Special Conditions Data Collection: Data not available as of this report

➤ ***Fresno Unified School District***

CDE conducted a Verification Review March 13-18, 2001. Data is in analysis for final report.

CDE Findings: As of this April 18, 2001 report, CDE provides other data from CDE's Quality Assurance Process.

Local Plan: Data is not provided in this report.

Compliance Complaints: Two (2) compliance complaints were filed from November 30, 2000 through March 15, 2001. One case found noncompliant (Failure to implement the IEP) is under CDE –State Superintendent of Public Instruction discretionary reconsideration. The other case is open (investigation).

Reevaluations: CASEMIS data of December 1, 2000 indicates 216 students overdue for reevaluations

Annual IEPs: CASEMIS data of December 1, 2000 indicates 536 students overdue for annual IEP reviews.

1999-2001 CDE Follow up-Verification Review: Data not yet available

Due Process: Two (2) filings for due process from November 30, 2000 through March 15, 2001.

Special Conditions Data Collection: Data not yet available

➤ ***Holtville Unified School District***

CDE conducted an onsite follow up visit in Holtville Unified School District on January 25, 2001. New student records were reviewed for all areas determined noncompliant during the 1999-2000 verification review. CDE conducted interviews with parents, staff and administrators to determine: (1) are students receiving special education and services as stated on the IEP; and (2) district practices in determining and providing related services, transition notice to parents and transition services; and the use of supplementary aids and services as part of LRE requirements.

CDE Findings: As of this April 18, 2001 report, Holtville Unified School District has corrected all items of previously identified noncompliance found during the April 2000 Verification Review. In particular, 2 areas of reoccurring noncompliance were corrected (Transition IEP notices were not consistently used to invite other agency representatives; Parents were not consistently informed of the referral for special education or assessment). All noncompliant findings found in student record review of 1999-2000 have been corrected. The district's policies and procedures regarding each noncompliant finding were reviewed by CDE and contained appropriate IDEA and state law and regulation requirements. Interviews regarding selected students were conducted with staff, parents and administrators to ensure that IEPs were implemented as written especially regarding related services. These interviews indicated that students received services as stated on the IEP. Probing interviews were also conducted regarding district practices with parents, staff and administrators in the areas listed below. Other than psychological counseling, all interviews indicated compliant practices by Holtville USD.

CDE Findings: As of this April 18, 2001 report, CDE provides other data from CDE's Quality Assurance Process in addition to special conditions data requested by OSEP.

Local Plan: CDE received Imperial County's SELPA Local Plan on 3/15/01. CDE is in the process of reading and analyzing submitted information.

Compliance Complaints: One (1) compliance complaints filed from November 30, 2000 through March 15, 2001. (Local Resolution of issues)

Reevaluations: CASEMIS data of December 1, 2000 indicates –0- students overdue for reevaluations

Annual IEPs: CASEMIS data of December 1, 2000 indicates 4 students overdue for annual IEP reviews.

1999-2001 CDE Verification Review Follow Up. CDE collected and analyzed data, including interviews during the onsite follow up review. All systemic items corrected from the previous review. (Links to district's status report in Microsoft Excel 5.0/95 Workbook format at end of report)

Due Process: Zero (-0-) filings from November 30, 2000 through March 15, 2001.

Special Conditions Data Collection: During January 2001, CDE collected and analyzed data, including in-depth interviews with parents, staff (general and special education) and administrators during the onsite follow up review.

1. **Students with disabilities receive all of the related services set forth in their most recent IEP;**

CDE Findings: Follow-up site visit 1-25-01 indicates a student with IEP indicating follow-up consultation with district is in compliance. At the time of the follow up review, Holtville did not currently have any students requiring OT or PT in their current IEP. Speech and Language services are provided for students as stated on their most recent IEP. **Compliant 1-25-01**

2. **IEP teams ensure that students who need psychological counseling as part of FAPE receive it and that: (a) district do not have a practice of not listing these services on IEPs, or b) of advising parents that they can only seek these services through Community Mental Health Services;**

CDE Findings: Verification Review follow up date: 1-25-01 interviews with parents, teachers (general education and special education) and site and district administrators established that district does not have psychological/ counseling as a DIS service available if the existing process using County Mental Health fails. **Noncompliant 1-25-01**

3. **Eligible students IEP's include statements of needed transition services;**

CDE Findings: Follow-up site 1-25-01 visit found no evidence of noncompliance. IEPs contain required transition services language. **Compliant 1-25-01**

4. **Parents receive required transition related information before attending IEP meetings;**

CDE Findings: Follow-up site 1-25-01 visit found no evidence of noncompliance. Parents are informed when the IEP meeting is for transition services. **Compliant 1-25-01**

5. **Children with disabilities are placed in the least restrictive environment and not in more restrictive environments because IEP teams do not consider supplementary aids and services.**

CDE Findings: Follow-up site 1-25-01 visit found no evidence of noncompliance. IEP teams consider and provide as appropriate, supplementary aids and services and students are placed in less restrictive environments as determined by the IEP team. **Compliant 1-25-01**

➤ **Los Angeles Unified School District-District D**

CDE conducted a week long onsite follow up visit in Los Angeles Unified School District, District D, beginning March 19, 2001. New student records were reviewed for all areas determined noncompliant during the 1999-2000 verification review. CDE conducted interviews with parents, staff and administrators to determine: (1) are students receiving special education and services as stated on the IEP; and (2) district practices in determining and providing related services, transition notice to parents and transition services; and the use of supplementary aids and services as part of LRE requirements.

***Note:** CDE is conducting an onsite Verification Review of LAUSD District I during the week of April 9, 2001. CDE is conducting an onsite Verification Review of LAUSD District H during the week of April 16, 2001. LAUSD, District B, is conducting a CCR self-review due to CDE by 7/1/01. This is in addition to LAUSD's own practice of annual full district self-review.*

CDE Findings: As of this April 18, 2001 report, CDE provides other data from CDE's Quality Assurance Process in addition to special conditions data requested by OSEP.

Local Plan: See 1-10-01 OSEP report.

Compliance Complaints: Fifty-six (56) compliance complaints were filed from November 30, 2000 through March 15, 2001.

Reevaluations: CASEMIS data of December 1, 2000 indicates 19 students overdue for reevaluations

Annual IEPs: CASEMIS data of December 1, 2000 indicates 2, 95 students overdue for annual IEP reviews.

Due Process: From November 30, 2000 through March 15, 2001, LAUSD had 234 filings for due process

1999-2001 CDE Verification Review Follow Up (Links to district's status report in Microsoft Excel 5.0/95 Workbook format at end of report).

CDE Findings: As of this April 18, 2001 report, Los Angeles Unified School District, District D, has provided CDE will policies and procedures, staff notification and evidence of training. These documents were received and reviewed by CDE for all required corrective actions for each item of noncompliant finding. CDE reviewed policies and procedures and found them compliant with federal and state laws and regulations. These were required for all 79 areas of systemic noncompliance found during the verification review of 1999-2000 for LAUSD, District D (formerly Hamilton/Palisades Cluster).

CDE conducted follow up review of LAUSD, District D, during the week of March 19, 2001. From a review of student records, District D has clearly **demonstrated correction of over 50% of its noncompliance** with a correction of 35/79 items. This is due largely to LAUSD's training on policies, procedures and implementation of new IEP forms that better address all required areas of the IEP and in several areas, CDE technical assistance. (Links to district's status report in Microsoft Excel 5.0/95 Workbook format at end of report)

For district D, the areas of **continuing noncompliance** are related to: **Evaluations** (many evaluation reports are either not written or not placed in student files, timelines, contents, primary language, considering parent information, hearing and vision screening, etc), **IEP components** (student involvement and progress in the general curriculum; involvement of the general education teacher in the IEP; IEP descriptions of student participation with nondisabled students in nonacademic and extracurricular activities; supports to or on behalf of the student including descriptions of program modifications to enable the child to participate and progress in the general curriculum; IEP team consideration of language needs of the student who is an English Language Learner; and Notice.

Special Conditions Data Collection: *(Partial data provided as of this report)*

1. Students with disabilities receive all of the related services set forth in their most recent IEP;

CDE Findings: CDE continues to find serious systemic noncompliance regarding the provision of speech and language services for students whose IEP requires this service district-wide. This is based on district self-report, compliance complaint data and follow up onsite interviews with staff, parents and administrators. **Noncompliant 3-19-01**

2. IEP teams ensure that students who need psychological counseling as part of FAPE receive it and that: (a) district do not have a practice of not listing these services on IEPs, or b) of advising parents that they can only seek these services through Community Mental Health Services;

CDE Findings: To be determined in follow up CDE activities and in the two Verification Reviews conducted in April 2001.

3. Eligible students IEP's include statements of needed transition services;

CDE Findings: Review of student records only indicates that LAUSD, District D, has made continued compliance progress in this area. However, this evidence of improved compliance is for this subdistrict only. Until all follow up interviews occur in LAUSD District D and data is analyzed from the two Verification Review occurring in April, 2001, CDE will not confirm total district compliance in this area until all data is analyzed and compliance status determined. **Noncompliant 3-19-01**

4. Parents receive required transition related information before attending IEP meetings; and

CDE Findings: Same as above

5. Children with disabilities are placed in the least restrictive environment and not in more restrictive environments because IEP teams do not consider supplementary aids and services.

CDE Findings: To be determined in follow up CDE activities and in the two Verification Reviews conducted in April 2001.

CDE has begun probe interviews with staff, parents and administrators at the time of this report of April 18, 2001. This information will be most beneficial to CDE and LAUSD in understanding and correcting noncompliant practice regarding Least Restrictive Environment. No data is available from this CDE at this time.

➤ **Lynwood Unified School District**

CDE is in process of conducting a follow up review in Lynwood Unified School District, April 2001. New student records are to be pulled and reviewed for all areas determined noncompliant during the 1999-2000 verification review. CDE will conduct interviews with parents, staff and administrators to determine: (1) are students receiving special education and services as stated on the IEP; and (2) district practices in determining and providing related services, transition notice to parents and transition services; and the use of supplementary aids and services as part of LRE requirements.

CDE Findings: As of this April 18, 2001 report, CDE provides other data from CDE's Quality Assurance Process.

Local Plan: See 1-10-01 OSEP report. No changes needed.

Compliance Complaints: Three (3) compliance complaints were filed from November 30, 2000 through March 15, 2001. Only one complaint indicates lack of FAPE (RSP services not provided). One case withdrawn. One case is in investigation.
Reevaluations: CASEMIS data of December 1, 2000 indicates 39 students overdue for reevaluations
Annual IEPs: CASEMIS data of December 1, 2000 indicates 169 students overdue for annual IEP reviews.
1999-2001 CDE Follow up-Verification Review: Data not yet available
Due Process: One (1) filing for due process from November 30, 2000 through March 15, 2001.
Special Conditions Data Collection: Data not yet available

➤ ***Norwalk LaMirada Unified School District***

CDE is in process of conducting a follow up review in Norwalk LaMirada Unified School District, April 2001. New student records are to be pulled and reviewed for all areas determined noncompliant during the 1999-2000 verification review. CDE will conduct interviews with parents, staff and administrators to determine: (1) are students receiving special education and services as stated on the IEP; and (2) district practices in determining and providing related services, transition notice to parents and transition services; and the use of supplementary aids and services as part of LRE requirements.

CDE Findings: As of this April 18, 2001 report, CDE provides other data from CDE's Quality Assurance Process.

Local Plan: CDE is awaiting receipt of the SELPA local plan at the time of this report.

Compliance Complaints: Zero (-0-) compliance complaints were filed from November 30, 2000 through March 15, 2001.

Reevaluations: CASEMIS data of December 1, 2000 indicates 149 students overdue for reevaluations

Annual IEPs: CASEMIS data of December 1, 2000 indicates 223 students overdue for annual IEP reviews.

1999-2001 CDE Follow up-Verification Review: Data not yet available

Due Process: Zero (-0-) filings for due process from November 30, 2000 through March 15, 2001.

Special Conditions Data Collection: Data not yet available

➤ ***Mt. Diablo Unified School District***

CDE will conduct an onsite follow up review in Mt. Diablo Unified School District in April 2001. New student records will be reviewed for all areas determined noncompliant during the 1999-2000 verification review. CDE will conduct interviews with parents, staff and administrators to determine: (1) are students receiving special education and services as stated on the IEP; and (2) district practices in determining and providing related services, transition notice to parents and transition services; and the use of supplementary aids and services as part of LRE requirements.

CDE Findings: As of this April 18, 2001 report, CDE provides other data from CDE's Quality Assurance Process.

Local Plan: See 1-10-01 OSEP report.

Compliance Complaints: Three (3) compliance complaints were filed from November 30, 2000 through March 15, 2001. One complaint found noncompliance (Failure to implement the IEP-interim mediation agreement). Two cases are under investigation.

Reevaluations: CASEMIS data of December 1, 2000 indicates 61 students overdue for reevaluations

Annual IEPs: CASEMIS data of December 1, 2000 indicates 117 students overdue for annual IEP reviews.

1999-2001 CDE Follow up-Verification Review: Data not yet available

Due Process: Five (5) filings for due process from November 30, 2000 through March 15, 2001.

Special Conditions Data Collection: Data not yet available

➤ ***Oakland Unified School District***

CDE will continue monitoring with an onsite follow up review in Oakland Unified School District in April 2001. CDE began follow up onsite review on 2/21/01 with onsite review of documents provided to CDE as part of Oakland's Corrective Action Plan. New student records will be reviewed for all areas determined noncompliant during the 1999-2000 verification review. CDE will conduct interviews with parents, staff and administrators to determine: (1) are students receiving special education and services as stated on the IEP; and (2) district practices in determining and providing related services, transition notice to parents and transition services; and the use of supplementary aids and services as part of LRE requirements.

CDE Findings: As of this April 18, 2001 report, CDE provides other data from CDE's Quality Assurance Process.

Local Plan: See 1-10-01 OSEP report.

Compliance Complaints: Two (2) compliance complaints were filed from November 30, 2000 through March 15, 2001. One complaint regarding failure to implement the IEP is in CDE discretionary reconsideration. The other complaint had noncompliant findings regarding notice, timelines, IEP content and members and failure to implement the IEP.

Reevaluations: CASEMIS data of December 1, 2000 indicates 20 students overdue for reevaluations

Annual IEPs: CASEMIS data of December 1, 2000 indicates 115 students overdue for annual IEP reviews.

1999-2001 CDE Follow up-Verification Review: Complete data not yet available. As of 3/21/01, CDE has requested specific policies and procedures not found in the district's submission (approximately 22 items) As of 3/21/01, CDE

identified 14 students and their school site for record review and interviews with site administrators, students, parents, teachers, DIS service providers.

Due Process: Five (5) filings for due process from November 30, 2000 through March 15, 2001.

Special Conditions Data Collection: Data not yet available

➤ ***Pomona Unified School District***

CDE conducted a Verification Review February 5-9, 2001. Data is in analysis for final report.

CDE Findings: As of this April 18, 2001 report, CDE provides other data from CDE's Quality Assurance Process.

Local Plan: CDE information not provided in this report.

Compliance Complaints: Zero (0-0) compliance complaints were filed from November 30, 2000 through March 15, 2001.

Reevaluations: CASEMIS data of December 1, 2000 indicates 241 students overdue for reevaluations

Annual IEPs: CASEMIS data of December 1, 2000 indicates 174 students overdue for annual IEP reviews.

1999-2001 CDE Follow up-Verification Review: Data not yet available

Due Process: Two (2) filings for due process from November 30, 2000 through March 15, 2001.

Special Conditions Data Collection: Data not yet available

➤ ***Ravenswood City Elementary School District***

CDE will be conducting a Verification Review May 8-11, 2001. Data is not available at this time.

CDE Findings: As of this April 18, 2001 report, CDE provides other data from CDE's Quality Assurance Process.

Local Plan: CDE information not provided in this report.

Compliance Complaints: Zero (-0-) compliance complaints were filed from November 30, 2000 through March 15, 2001.

Reevaluations: CASEMIS data of December 1, 2000 indicates 13 students overdue for reevaluations

Annual IEPs: CASEMIS data of December 1, 2000 indicates 23 students overdue for annual IEP reviews.

1999-2001 CDE Follow up-Verification Review: Data not yet available

Due Process: Two (2) filings for due process from November 30, 2000 through March 15, 2001.

Special Conditions Data Collection: Data not yet available

➤ ***Sacramento City Unified School District***

CDE conducted follow up on site visits in Sacramento City Unified School District on December 15, 2000 and March 2, 13, 2001. New student records were reviewed for all areas determined noncompliant during the 1999-2000 verification review.

CDE conducted interviews with parents, staff and administrators to determine: (1) are students receiving special education and services as stated on the IEP; and (2) district practices in determining and providing related services, transition notice to parents and transition services; and the use of supplementary aids and services as part of LRE requirements. (Links to district's status report in Microsoft Excel 5.0/95 Workbook format at end of report)

CDE Findings: As of this April 18, 2001 report, CDE provides other data from CDE's Quality Assurance Process in addition to special conditions data requested by OSEP.

Local Plan: See 1-10-01 OSEP report. No changes.

Compliance Complaints: Five (5) compliance complaints were filed from November 30, 2000 through March 15, 2001.

One case went to due process. One case was compliant. One case is open. One of the two noncompliant cases was failure to provide RSP services.

Reevaluations: CASEMIS data of December 1, 2000 indicates 31 students overdue for reevaluations

Annual IEPs: CASEMIS data of December 1, 2000 indicates 66 students overdue for annual IEP reviews.

1999-2001 CDE Follow up-Verification Review: Sacramento City USD has corrected more than 50% of the systemic noncompliant findings as determined in review of student records. (Links to district's status report in Microsoft Excel 5.0/95 Workbook format at end of report).

Due Process: Five (5) filings for due process from November 30, 2000 through March 15, 2001.

Special Conditions Data Collection:

1. Students with disabilities receive all of the related services set forth in their most recent IEP;

CDE Findings: CDE review of student records and interviews with parents, staff and administrators indicate that students receive the related services stated on their IEPs. Follow up of district reported data in June of 2000 indicates correction of noncompliance for students not receiving OT and PT. **Compliant 3-13-01**

2. **IEP teams ensure that students who need psychological counseling as part of FAPE receive it and that: (a) district do not have a practice of not listing these services on IEPs, or b) of advising parents that they can only seek these services through Community Mental Health Services;**

CDE Findings: CDE conducted follow up on-site review in December 2000 and March 2001. From a review of selected student records and interviews with the staff, parents and site administrators and district office staff, students whose IEP requires psychological counseling receive those services. CDE found that the district does not have an accountability system for determining if students do or do not receive services as required on their IEP. Information on IEP accountability can be obtained through interview and any written evidence available from service providers ensuring that students receive services.

Compliant 3-13-01

3. **Eligible students IEP's include statements of needed transition services;**

CDE Findings: CDE follow up findings from review of student records and interviews with parents, staff and administrators indicate that not all students ages 14 and older receive the required transition services as part of their IEP. On January 19, 2001, CDE received the status of the district's provision of transition services to students as required in their 1999-2000 corrective action plan. As of June 12, 2001, 32 students had not received transition services. As of January 19, 2001, nine (9) students remain to have an IEP for the purpose of transition services. Interviews with parents, staff and administrators (in both follow up of selected student records and in depth probe interviews) regarding transition services language required in the IEP, indicate that at the site level, these requirements are not consistently implemented. Parents reported a high level of satisfaction regarding their student's progress and in particular, transition services. However, compliant practices are not consistently implemented in the district. **Noncompliant 3-13-01**

4. **Parents receive required transition related information before attending IEP meetings; and**

CDE Findings: CDE follow up review of student records and interviews with parents, staff and administrators indicates that the IEP meeting notice informs parents (and students) that the purpose of the IEP meeting is for transition services. (However, noncompliance is evident in the lack of transition services being implemented consistently therefore students and parents are not informed of the IEP meeting occurring for the purposes of transition services. This is a finding of noncompliant omission. Where notice is provided, the district is compliant. **Compliant 3-13-01** (Note: CDE will continue to monitor above transition item)

5. **Children with disabilities are placed in the least restrictive environment and not in more restrictive environments because IEP teams do not consider supplementary aids and services.**

CDE Findings: CDE follow up activities conducted in December and March will be continued to determine compliance status and district practices regarding placement in the Least Restrictive Environment with the use of supplementary aids and services. CDE review of IEPs reflect team decisions that include statements of supplementary aids and services. However, CDE continues monitoring regarding district practices re: LRE. **Compliance status undetermined 3-13-01.**
CDE Continued Monitoring

➤ ***San Diego City Unified School District***

CDE continues to conduct onsite follow up visits in San Diego City Unified School District beginning in January 2001. New student records are being reviewed for all areas determined noncompliant during the 1999-2000 verification review. CDE is conducting interviews with parents, staff and administrators to determine: (1) are students receiving special education and services as stated on the IEP; and (2) district practices in determining and providing related services, transition notice to parents and transition services; and the use of supplementary aids and services as part of LRE requirements.

CDE Findings: As of this April 18, 2001 report, CDE provides other data from CDE's Quality Assurance Process in addition to special conditions data requested by OSEP.

Local Plan: CDE received a total revised Local Plan 3/1/01. All items were submitted as required. CDE has conducted a first read on the plan. Full data not available for this report.

Compliance Complaints: Ten (10) compliance complaints were filed from November 30, 2000 through March 15, 2001. Five cases indicate noncompliant findings in failure to implement the IEP (among other noncompliant procedural findings). Two cases still being investigated. One case withdrawn. One case went to due process. One case found procedural noncompliance.

Reevaluations: CASEMIS data of December 1, 2000 indicates 232 students overdue for reevaluations

Annual IEPs: CASEMIS data of December 1, 2000 indicates 361 students overdue for annual IEP reviews.

1999-2001 CDE Follow up-Verification Review: Data not yet available.

Due Process: Seventeen (17) filings for due process from November 30, 2000 through March 15, 2001.

Special Conditions Data Collection: Data not available as of this report

➤ ***San Francisco Unified School District***

CDE will be conducting a Verification Review follow up in April and May 2001. Data is not available at this time.

CDE Findings: As of this April 18, 2001 report, CDE provides other data from CDE's Quality Assurance Process.

Local Plan: CDE information not provided in this report.

Compliance Complaints: Five (5) compliance complaints were filed from November 30, 2000 through March 15, 2001.

One case is noncompliant (Failure to implement the IEP-speech and language). Four (4) are open with investigations being conducted. **Reevaluations:** CASEMIS data of December 1, 2000 indicates –0- students overdue for reevaluations

Annual IEPs: CASEMIS data of December 1, 2000 indicates 1041 students overdue for annual IEP reviews.

1999-2001 CDE Follow up-Verification Review: Data not yet available

Due Process: Two (2) filings for due process from November 30, 2000 through March 15, 2001.

Special Conditions Data Collection: Data not yet available

➤ ***Santa Barbara Elementary School District***

CDE conducted an onsite follow up review in Santa Barbara Elementary School District on March 8-9, 2001. CDE conducted interviews with parents, staff and administrators to determine: (1) are students receiving special education and services as stated on the IEP; and (2) district practices in determining and providing related services, transition notice to parents and transition services; and the use of supplementary aids and services as part of LRE requirements. (Links to district's status report in Microsoft Excel 5.0/95 Workbook format at end of report)

CDE Findings: As of this April 18, 2001 report, CDE provides other data from CDE's Quality Assurance Process in addition to special conditions data requested by OSEP.

Local Plan: See 1-10-01 OSEP report

Compliance Complaints: Zero (-0-) compliance complaints were filed from November 30, 2000 through March 15, 2001.

Reevaluations: CASEMIS data of December 1, 2000 indicates –0- students overdue for reevaluations

Annual IEPs: CASEMIS data of December 1, 2000 indicates –0-students overdue for annual IEP reviews.

1999-2001 CDE Follow up-Verification Review: Three systemic noncompliances found. All individual student noncompliances corrected. (Links to district's status report in Microsoft Excel 5.0/95 Workbook format at end of report)

Due Process: One (1) filing for due process from November 30, 2000 through March 15, 2001.

Special Conditions Data Collection:

1. Students with disabilities receive all of the related services set forth in their most recent IEP;

CDE Findings: CDE selected and reviewed student records and conducted interviews with site staff (general and special education teachers and DIS providers), parents and administrators (site and district level). CDE findings indicate that students receive the services as stated on their IEP. **Compliant 3-9-01**

2. IEP teams ensure that students who need psychological counseling as part of FAPE receive it and that: (a) district do not have a practice of not listing these services on IEPs, or b) of advising parents that they can only seek these services through Community Mental Health Services;

CDE Findings: CDE reviewed student records and conducted follow up interviews (staff, parents, administrators) demonstrated that students receive psychological counseling and parents are not told that the only means to obtain counseling services is through county mental health. **Compliant 3-9-01**

3. Eligible students IEP's include statements of needed transition services; NA (K-6 elementary school district)

4. Parents receive required transition related information before attending IEP meetings; NA (K-6 elementary school district)

5. Children with disabilities are placed in the least restrictive environment and not in more restrictive environments because IEP teams do not consider supplementary aids and services.

CDE Findings: CDE follow up review of student records and interviews with parents, staff and administrators indicate that the district's practice is to consider LRE for each student including the use of supplementary aids and services.

Compliant 3-9-01

➤ ***San Pasqual Unified School District***

CDE conducted an onsite follow up visit in San Pasqual Unified School District on January 24, 2001. New student records were reviewed for all areas determined noncompliant during the 1999-2000 verification review. CDE conducted interviews with parents, staff and administrators to determine: (1) are students receiving special education and services as stated on the

IEP; and (2) district practices in determining and providing related services, transition notice to parents and transition services; and the use of supplementary aids and services as part of LRE requirements. (Links to district's status report in Microsoft Excel 5.0/95 Workbook format at end of report)

CDE Findings: As of this April 18, 2001 report, CDE provides other data from CDE's Quality Assurance Process in addition to special conditions data requested by OSEP.

Local Plan: CDE received Imperial County SELPA Local Plan 3-15-01. CDE will conduct a first and second read. Data not available for this report.

Compliance Complaints: Zero (-0-) compliance complaints were filed from November 30, 2000 through March 15, 2001.

Reevaluations: CASEMIS data of December 1, 2000 indicates -0- students overdue for reevaluations

Annual IEPs: CASEMIS data of December 1, 2000 indicates 8 students overdue for annual IEP reviews.

1999-2001 CDE Follow up-Verification Review: San Pasqual USD has corrected all previous noncompliances. New systemic noncompliances noted below and in attachment. (Links to district's status report in Microsoft Excel 5.0/95 Workbook format at end of report)

Due Process: One (1) filing for due process from November 30, 2000 through March 15, 2001.

Special Conditions Data Collection:

1. Students with disabilities receive all of the related services set forth in their most recent IEP;

CDE Findings: CDE conducted an onsite follow up visit 1/24/01. Review of speech and language provider service logs indicate that some students do not receive services according to their IEP. The district is to monitor and provide documentation to CDE by 3/6/01 to demonstrate correction. CDE to re-verify noncompliance correction by 6-01-01.
Noncompliant 1-24-01

2. IEP teams ensure that students who need psychological counseling as part of FAPE receive it and that: (a) district do not have a practice of not listing these services on IEPs, or b) of advising parents that they can only seek these services through Community Mental Health Services;

CDE Findings: CDE conducted an on site follow up review on 1-24-01. Through interviews with staff, parents and administration, evidence indicates that the district provides counseling when parents do not follow through with the referral and/or services provided by County Mental Health. One IEP invitation for one teacher did not include transition as the purpose of the meeting. The district will provide evidence to CDE by 3-06-01 that all IEPs held for the purpose of transition are so indicated in the IEP meeting notice. CDE to verify correction of noncompliance by 6-01-01.
Noncompliant 1-24-01

3. Eligible students IEP's include statements of needed transition services;

CDE Findings: CDE onsite follow up review on 1-24-01, student record reviews and interviews with parents and staff indicates that IEPs are conducted and contain required transition services language. One IEP invitation for one teacher did not include transition as the purpose of the meeting. **Compliant 1-24-01**

4. Parents receive required transition related information before attending IEP meetings;

CDE Findings: CDE onsite follow up review on 1-24-01 with review of student records and interviews with parents indicates that most parents are informed that the purpose of the IEP meeting is for transition services. One IEP invitation for one teacher did not include transition as the purpose of the meeting. The district will provide evidence to CDE by 3-06-01 that all IEPs held for the purpose of transition are so indicated in the IEP meeting notice. CDE to verify correction of noncompliance by 6-01-01. **Noncompliant 1-24-01**

5. Children with disabilities are placed in the least restrictive environment and not in more restrictive environments because IEP teams do not consider supplementary aids and services.

CDE Findings: Per CDE onsite follow up review of 1-24-01, supplementary aids and services are provided for students as needed. Evidence of compliance was gathered through review of student records and interviews. The district is to continue inservice for staff on this requirement of the IEP. **Compliant 1-24-01**

➤ W. Contra Costa Unified School District

CDE conducted several onsite follow up visits in W. Contra Costa Unified School District on January 29, March 28-29, 2001. New student records were reviewed for all areas determined noncompliant during the 1999-2000 verification review. CDE conducted interviews with parents, staff and administrators to determine: (1) are students receiving special education

and services as stated on the IEP; and (2) district practices in determining and providing related services, transition notice to parents and transition services; and the use of supplementary aids and services as part of LRE requirements. (Links to district's status report in Microsoft Excel 5.0/95 Workbook format at end of report)

CDE Findings: As of this April 18, 2001 report, CDE provides other data from CDE's Quality Assurance Process in addition to special conditions data requested by OSEP.

Local Plan: See 1-10-01 OSEP report. CDE approved charter school language 2/01.

Compliance Complaints: One (1) compliance complaint filed from November 30, 2000 through March 15, 2001 (withdrawn).

Reevaluations: CASEMIS data of December 1, 2000 indicates 659 students overdue for reevaluations

Annual IEPs: CASEMIS data of December 1, 2000 indicates 328 students overdue for annual IEP reviews.

1999-2001 CDE Follow up-Verification Review: W. Contra Costa USD has corrected the majority of all systemic noncompliant findings (4 noncompliances remain) (Links to district's status report in Microsoft Excel 5.0/95 Workbook format at end of report)

Due Process: Two (2) filings for due process from November 30, 2000 through March 15, 2001.

Special Conditions Data Collection:

1. Students with disabilities receive all of the related services set forth in their most recent IEP;

CDE Findings: CDE review of student records and interviews with parents, staff and administrators indicate that students receive the related services stated on their IEPs. CDE follow up team reviewed selected student records and conducted interviews and viewed any written evidence to determine if these selected students received the related services on their IEP. CDE also conducted in depth probe interviews regarding the district's practices in ensuring that all students receive related services as stated on their IEP. In all processes of follow up, CDE did not find evidence of noncompliance. **Compliant 3/28/01**

2. IEP teams ensure that students who need psychological counseling as part of FAPE receive it and that: (a) district do not have a practice of not listing these services on IEPs, or b) of advising parents that they can only seek these services through Community Mental Health Services;

CDE Findings: CDE team conducted follow up activities with the district with a review of student records and targeted interviews with staff, parents and administrators to ensure that students received psychological counseling as stated on their IEPs. Further probe interviews were conducted regarding the district's practice in providing psychological services for students including probing into the practices of how these services are provided in relationship to services provided for eligible students from county mental health. There were no noncompliant findings. Students receive psychological counseling services as stated on their IEP. CDE findings also confirm compliance regarding the district's practice regarding the provision of psychological counseling. Parents are not told to rely on county mental health as the only source to receive psychological counseling. Interviews further confirmed this practice. **Compliant 3-28-01**

3. Eligible students IEP's include statements of needed transition services;

CDE Findings: CDE onsite review of student records with follow up interviews for IEP implementation and probe interviews with parents, general and special education staff and administrators indicate that IEPs are conducted for the purposes of transition services. Per interviews, transition services as part of the IEP, occurs for students ages 14 and older (younger, if appropriate).

Compliant 3-28-01

4. Parents receive required transition related information before attending IEP meetings;

CDE Findings: CDE onsite review of student records with follow up interviews for IEP implementation and probe interviews with parents, general and special education staff and administrators indicate that parents are informed when the IEP meeting is for the purpose of transition services. **Compliant 3-28-01**

5. Children with disabilities are placed in the least restrictive environment and not in more restrictive environments because IEP teams do not consider supplementary aids and services.

CDE Findings: CDE team conducted an on site follow up review that included record reviews and IEP implementation interviews plus probe interviews on LRE practices with staff, parents, general and special education staff and administrators. From interviews, findings indicate the children with disabilities are not being placed in the least

**restrictive environment due to the lack of consideration of supplementary aids and services by IEP teams. Compliant
3-28-01**

Links to district's status report in Microsoft Excel 5.0/95 Workbook format:

Cajon Valley Union School District – Letter to District Superintendent (Microsoft Word 6.0/95) - Data File

Holtville Unified School District - Data File

Los Angeles Unified School District - Data File

Sacramento City Unified School District - Data File

San Pasqual Unified School District - Data File

Santa Barbara Elementary School District - Data File

West Contra Costa Unified School District - Data File